



Karen Morrison
Director

Department of Pesticide Regulation

Gavin Newsom
Governor

Yana Garcia
Secretary for
Environmental Protection

PESTICIDE REGISTRATION AND EVALUATION COMMITTEE (PREC) Meeting Minutes – May 15, 2026

Committee Members/Alternates in Attendance:

David Fairman (alternate) – State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)
Jonathan Williams (alternate) – SWRCB
Elizabeth Marder – California Department of Public Health (CDPH)
Fabiola Estrada – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 9
Fatemeh Ganjisaffar – California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA)
Kevi Mace (alternate) – CDFA
Katie Sutherland-Ashley – Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA)
Kristen Pidcock – CalRecycle
Mai Ngo – Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)
Matt Hengel – University of California (UC), Davis, IR-4 Program and Environmental Toxicology
Nan Singhasemanon (PREC Chair) – Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR)
Stan Armstrong – Air Resources Board (CARB)
Tom Ineichen – Structural Pest Control Board (SPCB)

Visitors in Attendance:

Note: Only attendees who identified themselves or could be identified by DPR are listed.

Anne Katten, California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation (CRLAF)
April Vingum, Bell Labs
Chris de Nijs, Nevada County Dept of Agriculture
Christina Wilkinson, Science and Regulatory Consultants (SRC)
Connie Clarke, Pet IQ
Emily Marquez, Pesticide Action Network (PAN)
Emily Saad, Exponent
George Cavinta, Norwood Associates
Gloria Abarca, CSI
James Nakashima, OEHHA
Jing Tao, OEHHA
Jovana Bradaric, Syngenta
Kathleen Kilpatrick
Karen Silva, Corteva
Lauren Perkinson
Lynn Georges, Wilbur-Ellis
Michael Barber, SBM Life Science Corp

Patricia Kopta-Lamond, Arxada
Rhonda Stevenson
Roberta Firoved
Tammy Qualls
Vicki Ghaffarzadeh, Valent

DPR Staff in Attendance:

Aisha Shahid – Environmental Monitoring Branch
Ajay Kumar – Pesticide Registration Branch
Alyssa Freeman – Pesticide Registration Branch
Andrew Turcotte – Pesticide Registration Branch
Anna Maddison – Pesticide Registration Branch
Brittanie Clendenin – Pesticide Registration Branch
Chunbo Zhang – Human Health Assessment Branch
Daisy Reynaga – Worker Health and Safety Branch
Donald Antonowich – Pesticide Evaluation Branch
Elias Bunting – Integrated Pest Management Branch
Jeanne Martin – Enforcement Branch
John Adragna – Human Health Assessment Branch
Jolynn Mahmoudi-Haeri – Pesticide Registration Branch
Laura Benn – Pesticide Registration Branch
Lauren Timmons – Pesticide Registration Branch
Laurie Brajkovich – Pesticide Programs Division
Maya Beal – Pesticide Registration Branch
Megan Bertrand – Pesticide Registration Branch
Nan Singhasemanon – Pesticide Programs Division
Natalie Jarrell – Pesticide Registration Branch
Shelley Lopez – Pesticide Registration Branch
Taylor Whitehill – Pesticide Registration Branch
Ujjwala Morthala – Pesticide Registration Branch

1. Introductions and Committee Business – Nan Singhasemanon, Chair, DPR

- a. DPR released our first progress report on our 2024-2028 Strategic Plan that summarized and outlined our accomplishments & the progress made across the department that reflects a 98% completion rate on key performance milestones. I had shared this noteworthy item directly with the committee. The progress report, along with a new interactive dashboard that provides a visual summary and status updates of our performance metrics, has also been made publicly accessible on our webpage. DPR plans to provide this update on an annual basis.
- b. The next item is that DPR recently released the California Council on Science and Technology's (CCST's) review of post-harvest commodity fumigation and alternatives that is part of DPR's Fumigant Alternatives Study. The news release and post-harvest

report can be found under the News and Announcement section of DPR's main landing page. The PREC may recall that CCST presented the initial portion of the study that focused on 1,3-D and chloropicrin to the PREC in May of last year. Similarly, CCST will be returning at the next PREC in July to present from their most recent report focusing on methyl bromide, sulfuryl fluoride, phosphine and propylene oxide use as post-harvest commodity fumigants and their potential alternatives.

- c. DPR proposed regulations around pesticide treated seeds. A workshop was held in October last year and we also had a presentation at last November's PREC meeting on a potential regulatory framework. These regulations would establish definitions for pesticide treated seeds as well as establish requirements for use reporting and establish exemptions from registration and regulatory requirements when certain conditions are met. The public comment period on these [proposed regulations](#) began May 15th and closes on June 29th.

Note that the PREC meeting presentations were summarized using artificial intelligence and have been reviewed for accuracy.

2. CalPEST (California Pesticide Electronic Submission Tracking System) – Shelley Lopez and Laura Benn, Pesticide Registration Branch

The first part of the presentation was delivered by Shelley Lopez, Environmental Program Manager with DPR's Registration Branch, who introduced the California Pesticide Electronic Submission Tracking System (CalPEST) and described how it has fundamentally transformed DPR's pesticide registration process. Lopez explained that CalPEST was developed to modernize and streamline the department's workflow by creating a fully integrated information management system capable of supporting online submission, routing, and tracking of all registration-related materials. She noted that prior to development, DPR relied on multiple disconnected systems and substantial amounts of paper documentation, which limited efficiency and made it difficult for both staff and registrants to access and manage the materials associated with registration actions. She emphasized that since development began in 2022, the project's goals have been to integrate existing systems, improve staff efficiency, and reduce the time required to accept, review, and process pesticide registration submissions. Early indicators show that these goals are being met, with noticeable decreases in DPR's application queue and significant improvements in staff access to the documents they need for evaluation.

Lopez outlined the phased rollout of CalPEST, noting that the first implementation in September 2024 allowed registrants and their agents to create accounts and carry out key registration actions electronically, including submitting new products, renewing licenses, submitting fees, managing company changes, and uploading data such as adverse effects reports. She explained that this launch represented a major shift for the program, providing registrants with real-time access to the status of their submissions and giving staff a unified platform for processing and routing materials. A second implementation, completed in October 2025, expanded the system to include submissions for special local needs registrations and emergency exemptions, added further

system refinements, and introduced redesigned public search functionality. The public now has access to advanced search tools and to currently accepted labels associated with registered products, which had not been possible under the previous system.

To illustrate the scale of modernization, Lopez described the limitations of DPR's legacy system, which was built decades earlier and did not support electronic payment, modern search capabilities, or efficient document management. She emphasized that CalPEST is built on a contemporary Microsoft platform that will continue to receive technological updates. In the past, submissions, studies, chemicals, and products were tracked in separate systems that did not communicate with one another, leading to inefficiencies and incomplete data capture. Under CalPEST, all documents are electronic, multiple staff can review submissions simultaneously, and users have tools for locating and comparing documents, including side-by-side label comparison. She added that the system now captures detailed metrics on submissions and processing timelines, allowing DPR to produce more comprehensive performance reports.

Lopez also described several significant process changes resulting from CalPEST. DPR now accepts electronic payments via credit card or electronic funds transfer, with payments processed securely by a contracted third party; registrants may alternatively submit checks while still submitting materials electronically. User accounts are assigned at the individual level for security, and individuals may be associated with multiple companies in different roles. Accepted labels are no longer mailed to companies; instead, they are delivered electronically through CalPEST with a digital acceptance cover sheet appended to the label. Company licenses now include all active products and may be generated on demand by authorized users, including at the start of the new calendar year if renewal has been completed.

Lopez reported strong adoption of the system. As of May 11, more than one thousand individual users had created accounts, and over twelve hundred companies had at least one registered user. Since launch, 5,480 submissions had been entered into the system, with more than sixty percent completed. Approximately 1,700 of these submissions were new products, nearly twenty-eight hundred were amendments, and about one thousand were standalone data submissions. In 2026, over ninety percent of all submissions were submitted electronically, with an even higher percentage observed in the most recent month. More than eleven thousand products had been renewed through CalPEST this year, and nearly seventeen thousand fee items had been paid electronically since launch. Even for the remaining paper submissions received, staff scan and upload them, so the full review process remains electronic.

Lopez concluded her portion of the presentation by noting that the CalPEST help webpage includes links to the public search system, user guides, tutorial videos, and a monitored support email.

Laura Benn, Research Data Specialist, then presented a detailed walk-through of CalPEST's new public search features. She explained that the public does not need an account to use the searches, though logged-in users can access the link from their dashboard. Benn demonstrated the layout of the search interface, which consolidates all search tools—products, studies, chemicals, and special regulatory actions—onto a single page with a left-side navigation menu.

She reviewed the expanded search fields available in the new product search, including registration characteristics, formulation information, use patterns, application methods, equipment types, and detailed chemical filtering. The system supports multiple criteria, operators such as greater-than or less-than for chemical concentrations, and the ability to add multiple chemical records to refine results. Search results can be exported to Excel, and users may generate full or brief product reports. Currently accepted labels appear directly within each full product report, improving transparency and access. Benn noted that DPR continues to scan and upload historical paper labels, and once added, these will become publicly visible through the same interface. Labels not currently displayed may be requested through the Public Records Act portal.

Benn next demonstrated the study search, explaining that users may search by values such as chemical, study number, title, type, or product name. Study reports include hyperlinks to related product reports. She described the chemical search, which allows users to locate chemical information, synonyms, CAS numbers, and associated products, and provides the option of exporting chemical lists to Excel. Lastly, Benn reviewed the special regulatory actions search, which combines special local need registrations and emergency exemptions into one searchable interface. Users may filter by fields such as action type, applicant, issue date, chemical, county, pest, or application method. Special regulatory action reports follow a consistent layout and the search results may also be exported.

Benn concluded by demonstrating the help resources integrated into the system, including the Help Page with its left-side navigation and the embedded video tutorial playlist covering account setup, company association, and renewals. She noted that an updated external user guide is in progress and will be posted when complete.

Committee Comments

Mai Ngo (DTSC): This was a great presentation. I did have a question about the search function. Are these studies that are available publicly or are these studies that were submitted as part of the registration process? For example, are there toxicity studies that the public can access? What kind of information is available for these studies on CalPEST?

Laura Benn (DPR): The search displays only basic information about studies. It includes studies submitted as part of registration as well as studies submitted for other reasons, but it does not provide the actual study. Full studies are available only through a Public Records Act request and are subject to disclosure limitations. The search provides high-level descriptors but not abstracts or detailed evaluations.

Tom Ineichen (Structural Pest Control Board): Is this going to be listing both products that have already completed registration as well as those still in the process? And would I be able to get an actual label of the product, or what information is available through these searches?

Laura Benn (DPR): Only accepted or previously accepted products appear in the search; products still under review do not. Product reports include access to currently accepted labels. Older or inactive labels can be requested through the Public Records Act. The system is not linked to external databases; it consolidates DPR's registration data.

Nan Singhasemanon (DPR): I know this isn't the focus of the presentation, but certain internal aspects of this system impact registration evaluation for our teams, and I understand it has been very helpful compared to past practices. Can you say something about that?

Shelley Lopez (DPR): CalPEST allows simultaneous review by multiple programs, replacing the old sequential, paper-based process. It improves version control through electronic document collaboration and provides staff with improved workload visibility and workflow efficiency.

Public Comments

Anonymous: How do you obtain a list of new active ingredients California registered in 2025?

Laura Benn (DPR): The product search cannot directly generate a list of newly registered active ingredients. Users may view all products registered in 2025 but will need assistance from DPR staff to identify only new active ingredients. DPR can provide this information via email.

Email correspondence (Laura Benn): I mentioned that it's not directly possible to find new Ais registered in 2025 in the search, so reach out via email, but I received a link to a report that we posted on the website. Here is the link for 2025: [New Active Ingredients Registered in California During 2025](#) and here's the link for all reports. <https://www.cdpr.ca.gov/reports-directory/> Users can type new active ingredient in "title" and we produce this report annually.

Tammy Qualls: I wanted to provide feedback that the new search functions have been so helpful and such an improvement. As a consultant for local public agencies—stormwater and

wastewater—CalPEST has made it so much easier and quicker to search for products and chemicals.

DPR Response: Thank you for your feedback.

Denise (Bayer Crop Science, LLC): When searching for data studies, is this also limited to one thousand records, with download ability limited to seven hundred records, as with the pesticide registration search?

Laura Benn (DPR): Only the product search is subject to the 1,000-record limit and 700-record export cap. Study searches do not have the same restrictions although large result sets may load more slowly.

Kathleen Kilpatrick (Safe Ag / Safe Schools Campaign for Organic and Regenerative Agriculture): Are so-called inert ingredients (i.e., stickers and spreaders) included in product descriptions?

Laura Benn (DPR): Some basic information may appear for adjuvants, such as whether a product functions as a spreader-sticker, but detailed chemical information is confidential and not displayed.

3. Registration Regulatory Update – Brittanie Clendenin and Jolynn Mahmoudi-Haeri, Pesticide Registration Branch

The presentation on DPR's upcoming pesticide registration regulatory update was delivered by Brittanie Clendenin and Jolynn Mahmoudi-Haeri of the Registration Branch. Clendenin began by explaining that DPR is undertaking a comprehensive modernization of its registration regulations, noting that the last major revision occurred in the early 1990s. Since that time, both statutory requirements and DPR's internal processes have evolved significantly, particularly with the recent launch of electronic submission capabilities through CalPEST and several procedural improvements implemented across registration programs. She stated that the goal of this rulemaking is to ensure the regulations reflect current practices, support accurate data collection, and strengthen the consistency and completeness of pesticide product evaluations conducted in California. The updated regulations will better align with DPR's current tools, workflows, and information management systems, creating a clearer and more efficient regulatory structure.

Clendenin described the scope of the proposed rulemaking as broad, involving amendments to multiple existing sections and the adoption of several new ones. She emphasized that the overarching themes guiding the changes are modernization, clarity, and efficiency. Together, the revisions are intended to improve consistency across the program, streamline reviews, and eliminate outdated or unclear reporting requirements. Due to the scale of the package, the presentation focused on five major groups of proposed changes. The first is alignment of the regulations with CalPEST, reflecting DPR's transition away from fully paper-based processes to an electronic submission system. The second is the update of DPR's application forms to clarify and refine the information requested from registrants. These updates are designed to improve data quality and take advantage of expanded search and tracking capabilities.

The third area involves establishing clearer definitions for key application types and regulatory terms used during the registration process. Clendenin explained that while terms such as "new major use," "new active ingredient," and "master label" have long been used at both the state and federal levels, they have not been defined in regulation. Codifying these terms will reduce confusion, increase transparency, and ensure that both registrants and DPR staff are using shared terminology. The fourth major change is the formal codification of the three types of registration changes DPR processes after initial approval: amendments, notifications, and non-notifications. Although these categories have long been used in practice, placing them in regulation will clarify which types of changes fall into each category, encourage timely label updates from registrants, and reduce unnecessary or misclassified submissions.

The final major proposal is a reduction in fees for notification-level changes. Clendenin explained that notifications typically involve minor, non-substantive label modifications, such as the addition of a symbol or graphic, that require significantly less staff time than amendments. Lowering the fee for notifications will align costs with the workload involved and may encourage registrants to submit timely updates to their labels.

Mahmoudi-Haeri then expanded on these proposed revisions, noting that the launch of CalPEST has already enabled registrants to submit new applications and amendments electronically, replacing the former paper-based process and improving workflow efficiency. She explained that the regulatory update will bring DPR's regulations into alignment with this electronic infrastructure. Mahmoudi-Haeri also highlighted DPR's ongoing efforts to refine the information collected on application forms, including the addition of fields that better support evaluation needs and improved searchability and tracking. In addition, improve and clarify the information that is captured for pesticide product formulations and to make a standalone form in alignment with U.S. EPA.

Mahmoudi-Haeri reiterated the importance of clearly defining terms such as "new major use," "master label," and "new active ingredient," explaining that these definitions will help DPR identify, review, and track applications in CalPEST with greater consistency. She also reviewed the rationale behind formalizing amendments, notifications, and non-notifications in regulation, noting that clear definitions of these categories will support transparency for registrants and promote uniform processing. She explained that DPR is proposing to lower the fee for notifications to reflect their limited scope and reduced review time.

Clendenin concluded the presentation by outlining next steps. DPR is currently finalizing the rulemaking documents and anticipates filing them with the Office of Administrative Law in the third quarter of this year, which will begin the formal notice and public comment period. DPR aims to complete the process and implement the revised regulations by the third quarter of 2027. She encouraged stakeholders to sign up for [regulatory email updates](#) and to reach out with any questions.

Committee Comments

None.

Public Questions

None.

5. Agenda Items for Next Meeting

None suggested from the committee.

The next PREC meeting is scheduled for July 17, 2026, at 10:00 am. This meeting will be held virtually on the Zoom platform and broadcast live on the [CalEPA webcast page](#)
<video.calepa.ca.gov/>

6. Adjourn